

REMARKS

The outstanding Office Action rejects claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, and rejects claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Alfares et al., entitled An Integrated System for Computer-Aided Design and Construction of Reinforced Concrete Buildings Using Modular Forms.

The Office Action also states that claims 3-5 and 8-11 are objected to for incorporating the rejection of their respective base claims by dependency.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, and 11 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. New claims 12 and 13 have been added. Claims 1-13 are now pending in this application.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is thanked for the telephone interview conducted on June 22, 2004, where the Examiner and the undersigned discussed the Alfares et al. reference and each of claims 1 and 6.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH, FOR INDEFINITENESS

The Office Action states that "said various data" lacks antecedent basis. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 6 have been appropriately amended. Therefore, it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Office Action objected to claims 3-5 and 8-11 for incorporating the rejection of their respective base claims by dependency. It is respectfully submitted that claims 3-5 and 8-11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, new claim 12 includes the limitations of claim 4

Application No. 09/529,765
SHBP004

Page 7 of 9

and its base claim 1 and new claim 13 includes the limitations of claim 11 and its base claim 6. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 12 and 13 are in allowable form.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 6, and 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The present invention pertains a system for manufacturing structural components used to construct building structures. Generally, the system includes a first station for designing the structural components and a computer aided manufacturing means for manufacturing each of the structural components. The first station and the computer aided manufacturing means are interconnected with a communication line to facilitate the transfer of data between the two components.

In contrast, Alfares et al. pertains to automating on-site construction projects. For example, Alfares et al. discloses a computer-aided construction planning system (CAPP) on page 334, which creates graphical activity networks that allow a designer to evaluate construction activities, their precedence, estimated duration, and the required resources. CAPP is focused on tasks related to project management. It is submitted that Alfares et al. does not teach or suggest the use of a computer aided manufacturing means as required in claims 1 and 6.

It is noted that Alfares et al. discusses modular forms of standard sizes that can help reduce the complexity of construction site activities. However, Alfares et al. does not teach or suggest a computer aided manufacturing means for making such modular forms.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Alfares et al. does not teach or suggest a computer aided manufacturing means for manufacturing building structural components, as required by claim 1. It is also respectfully submitted that Alfares et al. does not teach or suggest a computer aided manufacturing means for cutting building structural components, as required by claim 6.

Since each of claims 2-5 and 7-11 depends either directly or indirectly from one of claims 1 or 6, it is submitted that these dependent claims are likewise patentably distinct from Alfares et al. for at least the same reasons. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C §102(b).

SUMMARY

It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable and that this case is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. SHIBP004).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Phillip F. Lee
Reg. No. 46,866

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778

Telephone: (510) 843-6200
Facsimile: (510) 843-6203